

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 10-14, and 18-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 6-9 and 15-17 were previously canceled in response to a restriction requirement. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above captioned patent application in light of the remarks presented herein.

Allowable Material

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating allowable material.

Claims 10-14 are indicated to be allowable.

Claims 2 and 3 are indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

35 USC § 112

Claims 19 and 20 are indicated as rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand Claim 19, which recites, in part, “a means for further generating said pass/fail indicator signal as a function of said delayed clock signal,” to add an additional limitation to Claim 18 that recites, in part, “a means for further generating said pass/fail indicator signal as a function of said delayed clock signal.” The rejection questions whether the referenced means of Claim 19 “is the same or different than the” referenced means of Claim 18.

Applicants respectfully assert that the two referenced means may be the same or different as recited by the embodiment of Claim 19.

The rejection states that the recitation of Claim 20 “is indefinite because it is not clear what the ‘second trip signal’ is meant by and how it is generated.” Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to Figure 3A, *inter alia*, which identifies first and second trip signals.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 19 and 20 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention, and thus overcome the rejections of record. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 5,444,744, "Yamamoto").

Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that embodiments in accordance with the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4, 5 and 18-20 are patentable over Yamamoto.

Applicants respectfully assert that Yamamoto does not teach or fairly suggest "an event of said pass/fail indicator is correlated to a specific period of said clock signal at which said event occurred" as recited by amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that Yamamoto is void of any teaching to identify a "specific period" as recited by Claim 1.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

In the response to arguments section, the rejection argues that Yamamoto Figures 8, 9B and 9I "show that the event... is correlated to a specific period of said clock signal." Further, the rejection argues, "[f]igure 9I shows the event (I) that occurs at a specific period of said clock signal (B)". Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants understand Figure 9I to illustrate a repeating series of multiple pulses that occur "at every half period of the input signal" (column 7 lines 60-62).

Applicants respectfully assert that multiple pulses occurring at every half period of

an input signal cannot and do not teach or fairly suggest correlation to a specific period as recited by Claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that there is no teaching in Yamamoto to identify any specific period as recited, as Yamamoto teaches all periods are treated in a similar manner.

For this further reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 2-5 are allowable as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Applicants respectfully assert that amended Claim 18 overcomes the rejections of record for at least the rationale previously presented with respect to Claim 1. Applicants respectfully reiterate that Yamamoto is void of any teaching to identify a “specific period” as recited by Claim 18.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 19-20 are allowable as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5, 10-14, and 18-20 remain pending in the present application. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above captioned patent application in light of the remarks presented herein.


The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: July 18, 2006



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060